A8095-1F 8/85

TO WHOM DO THEY BELONG?

"A Profile of America's Runaway and Homeless Youth and the Programs That Help Them"

THE NATIONAL NETWORK

OF RUNAWAY AND YOUTH SERVICES, INC.

JULY 1985

The National Network
of Runaway and Youth Services, Inc.
905 - 6th Street, S.W.
Suite 411
Washington, D.C. 20024
202-488-0739

June Bucy, Executive Director

TO WHOM DO THEY BELONG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. Introductions & Acknowledgments.....1

II. Background.....4

III. Methodology.....9

IV. Findings & Commentary.....10

V. Conclusions & Recommendations.....21

VI. Epilogue: The Kids Behind the Numbers.....24

VII. Further References.....26

Appendices.....29

The National Network is grateful to Angelika and Joseph Saleh for the use of the cover photograph from their award winning documentary "Streetwise."

I. INTRODUCTION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since Congress established the Runaway Youth Act in 1974, concerned citizens, organizations and policymakers across America have gradually become more aware of the serious problems involving runaway and homeless youth and their families. Current estimates of the number of runaway and homeless children and youth in America range from 1.3 to 2 million each year. A few studies and extrapolations suggest that there may be as many as 4 million children who run away from home for at least one night each year.

Who are these children and youth? What are their problems and how serious are they?. There are no clear, discrete categories, but the following definitions are generally accepted. It is important to remember that children frequently fall into more than one category.

"runaways" are children and youth who are away from home at least overnight without parental or caretaker permission.

"homeless" are youth who have no parental, substitute foster or institutional home. Often, these youth have left, or been urged to leave with the full knowledge or approval of legal guardians and have no alternative home.

"systems kids" are youth who have been taken into the custody of the state due to confirmed child abuse and neglect, or other serious family problems. Often these children have been in a series of foster homes, have had few opportunities to develop lasting ties with any adult, are school drop-outs, and have few independent living skills.

"street kids" are long-term runaway or homeless youth who have become adept at fending for themselves "on the street", usually by illegal activities.

"missing children" can refer to any child whose whereabouts are unknown. It is most often used to refer to children who are believed to have been abducted and victims of foul play and/or exploitation.

There is no "typical" runaway or homeless youth. They are most often youth between the ages of 12 and 18. The runaway population is comprised of male, female, White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, urban and rural youth from all socio-economic classes, from every State and Congressional District in the nation.

Many of these children, however, are "throwaways" --young people who have been forced out of their homes by their families. Others have run away because they were physically or sexually abused or victims of extreme neglect. Providers believe that a high percentage of these youth run away because their families have become "dysfunctional", that is, the family has such economic, marital, alcohol abuse or mental health problems that there has been a total breakdown between the youths and families resulting in crisis situations. Finally, some of these youths are socially and emotionally troubled. They have experienced a series of other personal failures with their schools, the law, finding a job, drug and alcohol abuse, and other adolescent situations. They see leaving as their way out.

Most youth service providers agree that, in the vast majority of cases, the young people are running away from something rather than to something. The mistaken public perception that runaway and homeless youth are on the streets because they are pursuing a carefree and rebellious lifestyle is rapidly dissolving. If policymakers, the media, and the American public learn more about the problems and tragedies these children and youth face, it is our hope that more appropriate and cost-effective services can be implemented to prevent this large group of runaway and homeless youth from apprenticing into the next generation of homeless adults.

To Whom Do They Belong? A Profile of America's Runaway and Homeless Youth and the Programs That Help Them is the report of a needs assessment conducted by the National Network of Runaway and Youth Services based on survey data gathered from 210 youth service agencies across the nation. The purpose of this survey was to capture demographic information on the runaway and homeless youth coming to shelters and find out what programs serving these youth need. The survey's methodology and findings are discussed in Sections III and IV.

The purpose of this report is to analyze the survey's findings, draw some first-level conclusions, and raise some issues for consideration by service providers, policymakers, and concerned citizens. How many youth are coming to these shelters and what kinds of problems do they have? Do these shelters "work" -- do they help these troubled young people and, when possible, their families? What additional services are needed for these youth in order to redirect their lives towards self-sufficiency and law-abiding behavior and away from a future dependency on public assistance? Finally, what can policymakers and the general public do to help these youth and the shelters that serve them? Our report does not fully answer these questions, but it does provide valuable current information -- profiles of the youth, shelter services, and identification of

those programmatic areas in which future public and private investments on behalf of these youth and their families should be directed.

The question raised in the title, "To Whom Do They Belong?" is intended to generate further discussion on the most effective and humane approaches to helping these runaway and homeless youth. In a perfect world, the obvious answer would be to reunite all of these children with their families. Our world, however, is less than perfect. Many of these children have fled their homes because of abuse, neglect, or other serious family problems. For those youth simply to return to the same crisis situations would only lead to more problems. In fact, a 1983 survey by the Federal Department of Health and Human Services shows that about 50% of these youth have a realistic prospect of returning home or going to a foster care family. The issue facing policymakers is which service systems and programs can best resolve the problems of these youth and the attendent consequences to society which these problems exacerbate.

The National Network's response to the question "to whom do they belong" is that **these youth are best served by community-based shelters and youth programs which provide a mix of counseling and other support services in an environment where the youth feel safe.**

The National Network wishes to express its gratitude to the staff and Board of Directors of the 210 runaway and homeless youth services programs who responded to our eight page questionnaire. We are also grateful to Suzanne Tuthill, Ph.D. for assistance with the data collection and analysis. Don Mathis, the National Network's Associate Director, served as the coordinator for this project. No Federal or other public funds were used to carry out this survey or produce this report. We hope that this report contributes to greater understanding by the general public on the problems of these youth and the successes and needs of the shelter programs which help them.

Linda Reppond, Chairperson
June Bucy, Executive Director

The National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, Inc.

II. BACKGROUND ON THE NATIONAL NETWORK, RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH SERVICES, AND THIS REPORT

The National Network of Runaway and Youth Services is a national, nonprofit membership organization comprised of more than 500 regional, state, and local youth services agencies providing services to runaway, homeless, and other troubled children and youth. One of the National Network's major goals is to promote improvements in the service systems and public policies which affect these youth, other young people, and their families. In order to achieve this goal, the National Network periodically collects information on the shelters, the services they provide, and the children, youth, and families they serve.

The National Network:

- o provides training and technical services on youth issues;
- o publishes a bi-monthly newsletter;
- o conducts an annual symposium in Washington, D.C;
- o monitors federal and state policies which affect children, youth, and families;
- o conducts public awareness/education activities.

In 1984, the National Network implemented a national computerized information-sharing telecommunications system (YOUTHNET) and also became the administering agency for the National Fund for Runaway Children. This program division grew out of a 1982 series of cover stories in Parade Magazine by Dotson Rader on the problems and tragedies of America's runaway, homeless and street youth. The Fund receives donations from groups and individuals and awards these funds to youth shelter programs that need support.

The National Network is administered by a member- elected, nationally representative Board of Directors who are distinguished by their expertise in youth services and policy. (See Appendix) The National Network's office is in Washington, D.C. June Bucy serves as Executive Director.

National attention on the problems of runaway and homeless youth is a relatively recent phenomenon. In 1970, the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency held hearings on the increasing numbers of youth who were fleeing from their homes and were in danger. In 1972, concerned youth service providers and advocates met in Minnesota and recognized the national scope of the problem, the need for specific types of services for these at-risk youth, and the need for communication between shelters across the country. In September of 1974, Congress enacted. and President Ford signed, the landmark Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and the Runaway Youth Act. In 1977, as

Congress developed a greater understanding of the problem of homeless youth and throwaways, the law was amended as the "Runaway and Homeless Youth Act" (RHYA).

In 1975, a national survey by the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (now the Department of Health and Human Services) estimated that there were 733,000 runaway and homeless youth annually. 1984 estimates, which seem most reliable to the National Network, range from 1.3 to 1.5 million runaway and homeless youth each year.

Services to Runaway and Homeless Youth. During 1984, $23.25 million in funds were appropriated by Congress for the RHYA to support 260 runaway and homeless youth shelters across the nation. A portion of these funds were used to support the National Runaway Switchboard, a toll-free hotline and communication channel which counsels youth who are thinking about running away; provides crisis counseling and referral service to runaway and homeless youth, and brokers contact between the youth and their families. Finally, a portion of the RHYA funds go to innovative direct service projects and research directed at special issues and problems, e.g. family reunification strategies, independent living programs for older homeless teens, suicide prevention, employment and training services, juvenile prostitution, and others.

Many state and local governments fund and support services to runaway and homeless youth. New York, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Texas, Florida, Oklahoma, and other states make such funds available. Most shelters are administered by community-based non-profit agencies. Furthermore, most runaway and homeless youth shelters receive support from their local United Way, religious groups, corporations, foundations, and other private sources, including donations from individuals.

Staff and volunteers at the shelters help runaway and homeless youth, and when possible their families, by being accessible and responsive. Shelters are staffed and open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Hotline phone counseling is always available. The shelter provides a safe place for the young people to stay while these youth receive counseling, food, and other support services (e.g. health, education, family counseling, and more). The first goal of the shelter programs generally is to reunite the youth with his/her family by encouraging and helping the resolution of the intra-family problem(s). In those cases where successful family reunification is not possible, shelter staff work with the youth and other public and private social service agencies to secure the most appropriate long-term living arrangements for the youth.

In addition to crisis intervention services, many shelters across the nation provide other specialized services which the

youth need, including drug and alcohol counseling, long-term foster care, transportation, recreation, and work readiness training. As Section IV of this report will show, runaway and homeless youth programs effectively provide a mix of comprehensive services to these at-risk or high-risk youth, and when possible their families.

Since the 1974 implementation of the federal runaway and homeless youth program, shelters have been improving the quality and scope of their services to these troubled young people. Community agencies, such as Boys Clubs, the Salvation Army, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, YMCA, YWCA and others have become actively involved in serving runaway and homeless children and youth.

RATIONALE FOR THIS REPORT

Many media outlets, policymakers, and concerned groups have become interested in the scope and severity of the problems of runaway and homeless youth. A great deal of public interest in the plight of these children has been generated by feature stories on runaways in Parade, Life, Reader's Digest, The New York Times, and many other magazines and newspapers. Good Morning America, CBS Sunday Morning, ABC 20/20, Nightline, the USA Network and many other television and radio programs have carried segments on runaways during the past two years.

One important consequence of this media attention on youth problems is that key policymakers, community leaders, law enforcement officials, and others request more information than is contained in the media's case studies and anecdotes on individual runaway and homeless children. A need was identified for a national overview (with statistics) on the problems of these youth and how shelters help these youth.*

In November of 1984, the National Network Board of Directors instructed its staff to carry out a national survey and needs assessment of agencies which provide services to runaway and homeless youth. An eight page questionnaire was designed by National Network Board Members, staff, shelter directors, and volunteers with expertise in youth services. The questionnaire had three major sections. The first focused on the agency and its capacity for serving youth. The second requested numbers and information on the youth served. The third asked the agency to identify its program needs, success stories, and future priorities.

More than 900 questionnaires were distributed nationally; the exact number is impossible to determine as shelter administrators were encouraged to duplicate and circulate the questionnaire among their colleagues who had not received it. All member agencies of the National Network and all federally-funded runaway and homeless youth shelters were mailed the survey.

In February, 1985 preliminary survey results were released during the National Network's 11th annual symposium. Sections III and IV of this report represent the final numbers and findings. 210 agencies, representing more than 312 shelters and 230 foster homes serving

---

*Parenthetically, readers of this report may be interested in two other documents: Runaway and Homeless Youth, National Program Inspection (October, 1983) and the FY 1983 Annual Report to the Congress on the Status and Accomplishments of the Centers Funded Under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (issued February, 1985). Both of these reports were prepared by the Office of Human Development Services/Department of Health and Human Services.

runaways, responded to the survey. Respondents were from all 50 states and Puerto Rico.

To Whom Do They Belong? A Profile of America's Runaway and Homeless Youth and the Programs That Help Them, captures the results of this survey. The purpose of this report is to provide a current overview on the successes, needs, and types of runaway and homeless youth programs and the youth they serve. The National Network's intent is to inform policymakers, the media, and concerned groups and individuals about these cost-effective, crisis intervention services which are helping thousands of troubled young people and their families every day in every state of our nation.

III. METHODOLOGY

To Whom Do They Belong? A Profile of America's Runaway and Homeless Youth and the Programs That Help Them (hereafter referred to as TW) is the result of a pilot survey of 210 youth service agencies across the country. The purposes of this pilot survey were to:

1) generate data and descriptive information which would provide an up-to-date profile of the youth and the shelters.

2) find out what types of information shelters were or were not recording and what these data reveal.

3) trigger the National Network and youth shelters in gathering data which have not been kept, e.g. incidences of sexual abuse, suicide attempts, family service needs, staff training needs, and more.

4) use the findings from this survey to design a more appropriate data-gathering instrument with fixed-response categories.

5) use the narrative and anecdotal information to provide additional findings, future instrument questions, and clear up any ambiguities around present and future data systems.

6) determine whether there is a need for a more scientifically rigorous study.

More importantly in terms of the methodology, this study presents a national "profile" of these youth and services. That is, the design relies on nominal and ordinal level data from which only descriptive statistics can be derived. Specifically, the survey provided frequency distributions of program services, service needs, and numbers and types of youth served. The questionnaire and this research were not designed nor intended to provide detailed statistical inferences (e.g. causal relationships) between reporting categories. The "profile" is a summary of aggregate numbers and significant program needs. Expressed program needs will be noted as "significant" if more than 50% (105 of the 210) responding agencies identified the issue or problem as a need. "Other" program needs responses will include those with less than 50% response rate, yet are identified by such respondents as critical to their respective programs. It is important to remember that these expressed program/service needs are derived directly from the problems and needs which these runaway and homeless youth have when they arrive at the shelter.

To Whom Do They Belong? A Profile of America's Runaway and Homeless Youth and the Programs That Help Them is a profile of America's runaway and homeless youth and the shelters that serve them. The numbers and responses covering a one year period between 1983-1984 offer an up-to-date picture of these youth and the shelters.

IV. FINDINGS AND COMMENTARY

Survey Population & Numerical Results

By April 1985, the National Network had received surveys from 210 agencies which serve runaway and homeless youth. These agencies represent 312 separate shelter facilities and 230 individual foster care homes (for short and long term services to runaway and homeless youth). Of these 210 respondents,

- o 156 are funded, in part, by the federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA). These 156 represent 60% of all the RHYA programs.
- o 194 are community-based, non-profit organizations; 14 are public/municipal agencies; 2 are Indian tribal organizations.
- o Shelters from all 50 states and Puerto Rico submitted surveys.

To serve the youth in their communities, these 210 agencies maintain 2,815 beds and employ 2,813 full and part time staff. It is important to note that these shelters require staff coverage 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. To complement the staff, these programs recruited 8,418 volunteers who gave 810,513 hours of volunteer time and services. Additionally, these programs generated $2,606,510 worth of in-kind services and non-cash donations.

These shelters each accessed an average of 5 public and private funding services in addition to RHYA funds. These include a mix of other federal funds, state and local government resources, United Way and Community Chest, foundation and corporate grants, contributions from civic and religious organizations, donations by individuals, and proceeds from the respective program's own fundraising efforts or entrepreneurial activities.

The shelters provide an average of 13 different types of service to these troubled youth and their families; either directly or in cooperation with an established referral arrangement. These types of services include:

- o Shelter care
- o Individual counseling
- o Outreach to youth
- o Education
- o Pre-employment training
- o Employment
- o Transportation
- o Mental health services

- o Health services
- o Foster care
- o Family counseling
- o Drug and alcohol counseling
- o Services in cooperation with juvenile court (restitution and diversion)
- o Independent living
- o Recreation
- o Community hotline services
- o Group counseling
- o Legal services
- o Missing children's assistance
- o Aftercare (for the youth after they leave the shelter)

Youth Population Served By the Respondents

These numbers reflect the youth served by the 210 programs for a one year period during 1983-1984. Specifically, these programs:

- o provided at least one night of shelter to 50,354 youth; 27,038 female, 23,316 male.
- o sheltered 19,411 runaways, 6,669 throwaways, and 24,274 other youth, e.g. abused and neglected children placed in the shelter by local child protective service agencies, juvenile court referrals, youth who left home by mutual consent, and other crisis intervention placements.
- o reported serving 5,682 cases of physically abused youth.
- o reported serving 3,439 cases of sexual abuse.
- o provided services to an additional 101,568 nonsheltered youth and/or their families, and responded to 171,931 hotline calls and contacts.
- o were forced to turn away 6,732 youth because the shelter was filled to capacity and there was no available bed space.
- o turned away 3,518 youth because it was determined that the shelter was not appropriate for the youth's needs.
- o had an average positive termination/placement rate of 57%, e.g. the youth were reunited with their families, placed in a foster care or group home, helped to attain an independent living arrangement, or placed in some non-secure detention program.

Expressed Program Needs: Significant

Agency and service needs expressed by the respondents regarding their respective agencies were determined to be "significant" if they were identified by more than 50% (105 of 210) of the respondents. The survey showed the following needs as most critical:

- **Better salaries and benefits and more staff.** 86% of the agencies cited the need for salary increases for staff and/or the need for more staff. Shelter directors noted that staff turnover was a problem due to low salaries: A caseworker earning $11,000/year is trained by the shelter to work with troubled youth and then leaves to work for a county agency and earn $18,000/year; a degreed counselor can earn more and work under much less stress at the local post office. In addition to the need for adequate salaries, respondents also noted the need for better trained staff, especially for the necessary 24 hour/day coverage. Directors stated that if runaway and homeless youth shelter programs had salary and fringe packages comparable to public and other social service agencies in their locale that these staff would be more likely to stay with the program.

- **More Staff Training.** 74% of the agencies cited the need for more staff training, especially for working with multi-problem youth and especially in those geographic areas where the shelter is one of the few, if not only, youth service providers. Among the complex "presenting problems" (those personal situations and difficulties the youth have when they arrive at the shelter) those needing the most counseling are incest victimization, sexual abuse, juvenile court involvement, drug and alcohol abuse (including parental abuse), school failure, and medical/dental needs.

- **Continuum of services** 72% of the agencies cited the need for more outreach, preventive services, and aftercare for the youth in their communities. Preventive services include working with schools, other youth agencies, and community groups to show young people that running away is not the best solution to their problems. Prevention also can include youth and family drop-in counseling and parent education. Outreach includes having streetworkers and other counselors available to go out in those areas of the community during the hours that youth congregate, and reach the youth "on their turf". Aftercare refers to

those follow-up services which youth need after they complete their stay at the shelter, including counseling, education, employment services, family counseling and community referrals.

- Independent Living programs. 67% of the agencies noted that for many of their youth, especially older youth, age 16 and above, there is little chance of returning home, often no home at all, and little possibilitity of finding a foster home. Independent living programs offer a comprehensive mix of services including housing, life skills and money management, employment and training, remedial education, counsel--ing, and other services. Independent living components of runaway and homeless youth shelters enable the staff to continue helping the youths following their stay at the shelter (maximum 15 days), and thereby increase the youths' probability of becoming self-sufficient rather than welfare-dependent.

- Capital improvements of the shelter. 62% of the respondents cited the need for major maintenance and capital improvements of their shelter facility. Shelters comply with state and local licensing, fire and safety, and health codes. Because most shelters are community-based home models, these facilities undergo the same kinds of wear and tear that family dwellings do. Furthermore, these upkeep costs are exacerbated by the sheer volume of youth, staff, and volunteers who use the facility. Federal guidelines limit the amount of RHYA funds which can be used for renovation to 15% of the federal grant. Frozen pipes, a broken heater and the need for electrical rewiring can cause havoc with even the most carefully designed budget.

Expressed Program Needs: Other

"Other" program needs are those which generated less than a 50% response rate (less than 105 of 210 agencies), but given the number of respondents and the compelling nature of the descriptions of these problems, seemed worth noting.

- Mental health services. 41% of the agencies cited the need for more mental health services for the youth and families they serve, particularly access to specialized mental health services, e.g. victims of sexual abuse and incest, suicidal youth, difficult juvenile court referrals, and multi-problem families.

- **Foster care and long term placement.** 38% of the programs identified the need for specialized foster care homes and other forms of long term placement for youth after they leave the shelter.

- **Sexually abused children.** 31% of the respondents cited an increase in the number of sexually abused children and youth coming to their shelters. They also identified the need for staff training and other resources for working with these victims.

- **Physically abused children.** 29% of the programs cited an increase in the number of physically abused youth coming to the shelters.

- **Substance abuse.** 29% of the programs reported that drug, alcohol, and substance abuse were major problems for their youth.

- **Education and employment.** 28% of the programs cited the need for alternative education for their youth. 22% of the programs identified specialized employment and training programs as a need.

Are Youth More Troubled?

The survey asked programs to respond to the following question:

> "During the past year, National Network staff and others in Washington, D.C. concerned with runaway and homeless youth services and policy have heard comments from shelter staff to the effect that the youth they serve "are more troubled, have more serious problems, and require more specialized services" than the youth who were coming to the shelters 5 - 6 years ago. Does the experience of your program during the past year agree or not agree with this generalization? If it agrees, how? For example, some staff identify a greatly increased number of referrals from juvenile court: others note more youth with serious drug and alcohol problems have accelerated staff burn-out. What disturbing trends have you seen in the youth your agency serves and how has your program tried to address those problems?"

61.5% (129) of the programs responded that the youth they are serving seem more troubled and/or multi-problem than the youth they were serving 5-6 years ago.

1.5% (3) of the programs responded that the youth do not seem more troubled or difficult to serve.

37% (78) of the programs chose not to respond or else answered that it is difficult to ascertain a general sense of whether their youth clients are more troubled. Some respondents noted that their youth may seem more multi-problem only because staff had improved in their abilities to recognize and serve such troubled youth, or the community has greater expectations of the programs and refers more difficult cases to them.

COMMENTARY

The National Network's methodology for this study was not designed to generate casual inferences between specific survey answers and categories. The survey offers profiles of runaway, homeless, and other troubled youth and the shelters that serve them by compiling aggregate numbers, descriptive statistics, and anecdotal information. The National Network's intent also was to get a sense of what kinds of statistics shelters are keeping and examine what additional kinds of data shelters might consider recording.

One significant overall comment regarding the numbers included under "Survey Population and Numerical Results" earlier in this section is that several of the totals were under-reported. That is, several respondents noted that they do not keep records on such services, needs, and youth problems, e.g. the numbers of youth turned away, suicidal youth, hotline calls, homeless youth, incidence of sexual abuse, and other categories. Most of the 210 responses to the 8 page questionnaire reflected an adequate degree of recordkeeping by the shelters in terms of the numbers and types of youth. Adequate record-keeping is not a bureaucratic end in itself -- it is a valuable tool which shelter staff use to plan the most appropriate services for the youth, administrators use to determine the cost-effectiveness of their programs, and the agency uses to understand the problems and needs of youth and families in their respective communities.

Two of the most under-reported categories were abuse (physical and sexual) and the number of youth turned away due to no available bed space at the shelter. Many programs noted that some of the sheltered youth who the staff suspected had been physically and/or sexually abused were not counted in their agency's survey response because the abuse was not confirmed or disclosed by the youth during their stay at the shelter. Many youth do not admit to having been abused because they are afraid, either for their own safety or for what might happen to the individual(s) (often family members) who abused them. In some agencies question about abuse are not asked and if volunteered are not recorded due to philosophical policies about confidentiality. One program in New York, reporting 8,532 sheltered youth, is among those not questioning youth about abuse.

In terms of youth who were turned away due to a lack of bed space in the shelter, more than 60% of the respondents stated that they did not keep such records. The standard practice for handling such cases is that the filled-to-capacity shelter refers the youth to other shelters or programs in the area. In many communities, however "other" runaway and homeless youth shelters are few and far between.

The survey findings also dispel the notion that youth who come to runaway and homeless youth shelters are simply young people who are fretting over a routine adolescent squabble with their parents. The problems of these youth and their families are not simple. The reported levels of physical and sexual abuse (again, believed under-reported), the fact that 38% of the programs cited foster care/long term out-of-home placement needs for their youth, and the programs' expressed needs for more specialized mental health services and staff training indicate that shelters are working with youth and families who have serious and complex problems.

Another indicator of the multi-problem, "at-risk" nature of the youth is that the respondents identified 24,274 (48%) of the sheltered youth as having come to the shelter for reasons other than or in addition to being runaway or homeless. Specifically, many of these youth are placed in shelters by child protective service agencies because the youth have been physically exploited, abused or neglected. State and county child welfare agencies refer their youth clients to shelters while they await foster care, group home placement, or reunification with their families. A third segment of this "other" population are those youth who are placed in shelters by juvenile court and law enforcement officials while the youth await their hearings or court placements.

Many of these youth have been runaway, homeless, or on the street for some time, but are at the shelter because of their involvement with some other social service or juvenile justice system. The National Network informally refers to these youth as "systems kids". The successes and difficulties of shelters in working with these systems kids appears to be an issue worthy of further study and analysis. The need for basic education and independent living skills training are clearly priorities for this group.

MEASURES OF THE SHELTER'S EFFECTIVENESS

The survey results point to many acheivements and successes which runaway and homeless youth shelters across the nation have attained in working with troubled children, youth, and families. Some of the most notable findings include:

*__57% of the youth are reunited with their families or positively placed in a safe living environment.__ Similar to the earlier findings, this figure probably is lower than the actual number of youth whose lives and circumstances have been improved by virtue of their involvement with a shelter program. This number may be low in that shelter staff are not always able to maintain contact with and track the progress of the youth and their families for an extended period of time following the youth's stay at the shelter. Some programs had much higher positive placement rates than others. More research is needed to determine if this difference is a function of the intake criteria, the program policies and performance, or of the lack of long term resources available in the community for homeless youth.

The major significance of this 57% figure is that it offers strong evidence that shelter programs are an effective way of preventing these youth from a future of welfare dependency, criminal activity, adult homelessness, and other personal and family tragedies which result in serious drains on taxpayers and the economy. As policymakers and social science researchers examine the relationship between child abuse, runaway behavior, crime, and unemployment, it is important to note that a nationwide system of community based runaway and homeless youth services exists which offers a cost-effective alternative to a future generation of adults and families who cannot contribute to our nation's economic health and well-being.

Shelter programs, by virtue of the broad range of services which they provide, represent one of the most effective strategies for interrupting and closing off the apprenticeship of this generation of troubled youth into tomorrow's generation of homeless and disadvantaged adults.

*__The shelters provide a comprehensive mix of an average of 13 types of services which is the most effective means of working with the multiple problems faced by these youth and families.__ One problem for traditional social service agencies that work with at-risk young people and families is that in many cases, those agencies have a somewhat limited scope of services. For example, child protective services have an investigative base and cannot provide services unless there is confirmed abuse or neglect. The criminal justice system cannot mandate services unless there is a "crime" and a violator of law. Public schools

can only admit students who meet their jurisdictional requirements. Some agencies focus on employment and training, but have no remedial education services. Another agency may provide effective crisis intervention and counseling services, but not offer support services such as shelter care, follow-up or health services.

The 210 alternative agency respondents offer an average of 13 different types of services to the youth and families they work with, either directly at the shelter or through an established working relationship with another agency, e.g., health clinic, schools, recreation programs, and others. Resolution of an immediate crisis situation has a limited effect if the necessary support services such as follow-up family counseling, drug and alcohol abuse treatment, education, and other services are not available. By providing a mix of services to these youth and/or ensuring the youth's access to such an individualized package of services, shelter programs help young people turn their lives around by responding to their specific problems and needs.

Those private flexible agencies also serve their communities by filling the gaps that occur in services. In doing so they constitute a "window" into the service patterns and changing needs of high risk youth and families. Good trend reporting from those programs tuned to crisis intervention gives planners and funders insight into the emerging issues.

*<u>Runaway and homeless youth programs are excellent examples of public/private partnerships at the federal, state, and community levels.</u>Given the increasing competitivenes for federal and state funds, runaway and homeless youth shelters appear to be successful in leveraging a variety of funding sources and other resources in order to maintain the effectiveness of their services. Of the 156 respondents that receive funds under the federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, their federal grants on the average represent 31.6% of their program's overall budget. A strong case can be made that this federal support validates the importance of these services to other funding sources, local local policymakers, and the overall community. Subsequent to the enactment of the RHYA in 1974, some states -- most notably New York, Florida, Texas, Oklahoma and Wisconsin have passed their own runaway and homeless youth laws which provide additional funds to shelters. The 210 respondents had an average of 5 other funding sources during 1983-1984.

Private sector funds from a diversity of corporations, foundations, family trusts, religious and civic

organizations and other groups support runaway and homeless youth services in every state. But perhaps the strongest private sector confirmation of our nation's concern about these youth is demonstrated by the extent to which individuals volunteer and contribute their time, money and services. The survey showed more than $2.6 million worth of donated in-kind time and services and an additional 810,000 plus hours of volunteer time by more than 8,400 volunteers.

The diverse funding bases which shelter staff and Boards of Directors have worked hard to establish appear to satisfy even the most rigorous of imperatives that runaway and homeless youth programs must access the private sector and community resources if the shelters are to continue receiving public funds.

Additional commentary and analysis of the survey's findings are contained in the next section, "Conclusions and Recommendations."

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Briefly, other findings and conclusions from the survey include:

*Shelters and foster care programs in Pennsylvania, Hawaii, New York, and Kentucky are seeing a dramatic increase in the number of "throwaways" or "pushouts" -- young people who have been thrown out of their homes or are fleeing abuse by their parents. Programs in Iowa and Texas report an increase in the numbers of homeless /pushout youth as a result of the families' economic difficulties.

*Many shelters need more beds; programs have been turning away youth because their shelters were filled to capacity. Last year, an Arizona shelter had no space for 1600 youth; a Connecticut shelter turned away 546 youth and a Texas program 525 youth. Again, the National Network believes that the number of "turnaways" is even higher as 60% of the respondents said they do not collect this data.

*A tremendous need exists for comprehensive mental health services for runaway and homeless youth. Shelters in every state noted that they are seeing more youth with more severe mental health problems, including drug and alcohol abuse, suicidal tendencies, juvenile court involvement, family tensions, and psychiatric problems.

*Rural programs in Texas, Oklahoma, New York, and Wisconsin express the need for additional funds for staff and transportation to serve runaway and homeless youth in adjoining counties.

*Federal, state, and municipal funds expended for shelter services is money well-spent. The cost of shelter services is cheaper and more therapeutic than locking up youth in secure detention facilities. Community-based facilities such as runaway and homeless youth shelters are the most cost-effective and successful methods of helping the vast majority of high risk youth and families, although secure detention (a lock-up, restricted environment) may be necessary for those few serious offender/violent youth who are threats to the community's safety as well as their own,

*TW, in conjunction with other recent national studies, suggests that only 20%-25% of the runaway and homeless youth in the United States receive services from these programs and staff that have the ability and design to work with these multi-problem youth.

Conclusions: Three major conclusions from the survey lead to the recommendations detailed at the end of this section. The survey finds that:

1. Shelter programs serving runaway, homeless, and other troubled youth and their families work and work well.

In the ten years since the Federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA) was enacted in 1974, community-based services to runaway and homeless youth have become more sophisticated and responsive to the needs of these youth and their families. Shelters have broadened the types of services they offer, successfully competed for public and private funds, generated support and voluntarism in their own communities, received bi-partisan support from Congress, and most importantly have dealt effectively with an increasingly "at-risk" population of youth.

2. Existing shelter programs have service and program needs.

Implicit in the responses from the 210 agencies is the recognition that in order to maintain and strengthen their effectiveness, programs need more resources for specialized staff training, capital improvement of their facilities, increased capacity for more youth, adequate staff salaries, and additional service components. The need for complementary services for their existing system of services is probably the most crucial need in terms of having a sufficient mix of program responses to the diverse and severe youth and family problems which programs face.

3.
There are unserved and underserved communities across the nation that need the kinds of shelter and support services offered by ru naway and homeless youth centers.

The vast majority of runaway and homeless youth centers are 7 - 12 bed, home-like shelters. Urban programs expressed the need for additional (but not larger) facilities; rural programs expressed the need for serving adjoining counties or unserved communities. Estimates on the number of youth who run away for only a few days and then return home range from 50% - 60% of the 1.3 million each hear. Many of these youth do come to shelters; 1983 HHS records show that 47.5% (26,690) of all youth sheltered in federally funded centers were short-term runaways. Yet even if these youth who can return home quickly are factored out, there are more than 600,000 youth who are away from home and vulnerable to predators on the streets unless they find safe shelters.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following five major public policy recommendations are derived from the survey and from analysis of the survey results by the National Network Board of Directors, members, and staff:

1. Congress and the Administration should increase the annual appropriation of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to $50 million so that additional shelters can be opened, existing programs can be strengthened to provide more comprehensive services to more troubled youth, and innovative training models and service strategies can be tested, all with the goal of reuniting more families.

2. State governments in states which do not have state runaway and homeless youth acts should follow the leadership of New York, Florida, Wisconsin, Texas, and other states which augment private and federal funds to serve these youth. Another recommendation is that those states (25) which have Children's Trust Funds (state operated quasi-endowment programs) for child abuse prevention programs should include adolescent abuse prevention programs as a funding category. States without Children's Trust Funds should implement them through legislation.

3. The Department of Health and Human Services, specifically its Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF), should conduct further national studies and data collection activities on runaway and homeless youth and on the other types of youth, e.g. "systems kids", served by the shelters. The survey shows a need for more information about these youth and their families and about program models and service strategies that work best in helping these youth redirect their lives. ACYF should focus particularly on family dynamics which foster runaway/throwaway behavior, the numbers and causes of homeless youth, the incidence of chronic runaways, sexual abuse, and the need for specialized service components.

Equally as important as the gathering of this information is the distribution and marketing of the findings to runaway and homeless youth boards of directors and staff, federal, state, and local policymakers, school officials, law-enforcement officials, and other concerned groups.

4. Concerned policymakers, youth service professionals, and others must sustain a public education/media campaign which focuses on the problems and needs of these troubled youth. In order to strengthen and broaden the private sector and community support for services to these youthy, media coverage on the community and national level is necessary for improving services to these youth and their families.

5. The need for coordinated and more efficient services (e.g. crisis intervention, protective services, child welfare, education, health, juvenile justice, job training, mental health,and others) at the federal, state, county, and community levels compels the National Network to recommend that Congress and the administration formulate and enact a "National Youth Policy", patterned after the Older Americans Act. A National Youth Policy would provide opportunities and protections for all of America's youth and would serve as a valuable tool for state and local governments to plan and administer their services to youth and their families at the lowest possible cost. This proposed concept of a national youth policy does not entail a new billion dollar federal entitlement program. Rather, a national youth policy will systematically coordinate existing youth programs and policies while creating a legislative framework in which remaining needs and problems can be addressed.

VI. EPILOGUE: THE KIDS BEHIND THE NUMBERS

This report began with some narrative descriptions about the kinds of runaways and homeless children and youth who are served by the 210 agencies that responded to our national survey. As the report detailed the major results and findings from the eight page questionnaire, a concern arose that the aggregate numbers, program needs, implications, and policy recommendations would blur and detract from our central focus --the problems and needs of each of the more than 1.3 million runaway and homeless youth in America each year.

Many readers of this report have seen the award-winning documentary film "Streetwise" which graphically portrays the tragic lives of juvenile prostitutes and other street kids in Seattle. Other readers also have seen the series of cover stories in Parade Magazine, articles in Readers' Digest, and feature stories about runaways on CBS, NBC, ABC, and Capitol Cities Television. Furthermore, millions of Americans have had first person experiences with runaway and homeless youth, ranging from having a family member who was a runaway to seeing such youth wandering aimlessly on the street.

This epilogue is offered as a reminder that behind the numbers in this study are the individual lives and futures of a generation of America's at-risk young people. In spite of all the various problems and negative situations in which these youth are involved, they have the same personal aspirations and goals that most other youth have --a good job, a healthy family, a safe place to live, and to be responsible, law-abiding adults.

Many of the youth counted in this survey are without homes and families. A significant number of others have bounced around in foster care, group homes, or other child welfare service placements. Others have fled or been forced out of their homes due to serious abuse, neglect, or breakdown of the family structure.

"To Whom Do They Belong" poses, in fact, a rhetorical question. The blunt fact is that these children and youth belong to all of us , i.e. if the necessary family support, shelter, and other services are not available for these youth, our society will only incur a greater economic liability in terms of paying for the welfare, institutional, law enforcement, adult homeless, metal health, and other inescapable services and programs.

For many of the young people who seek help at runaway and homeless youth centers, their stay represents their last stop on the social services/juvenile justice systems' roller coaster before they became involved with or victimized by more serious problems. While the foremost goal of runaway and homeless youth shelter programs is to reunite these youth with their families, we have learned that in many cases this is not desirable or feasible. America is both a caring nation and a tax-paying nation; both of these factors necessitate support for the kinds of intervention and prevention services provided by runaway and homeless youth programs.

VII. Further References

The National Network of Runaway and Youth Services receives requests from across the country from concerned individuals who want to know about books, magazines, and journals which focus on runaway and homeless youth. The bibliography below is not complete but it does offer some useful resources.

Books

Able, T.P.,Children of the Evening. Academic Press, 1981

Arenberg, G.S., et.al.,Preventing Missing Children. Compact Books, 1984

Benton, J., Do You Know Where Your Children Are?. Revell, 1982

Brennan, T., et. al., The Social Psychology of Runaways. Lexington Books,1978.

Brenton, M.,The Runaways. Little Brown, 1978

Palenski, J.E., Kids Who Run Away. R&E Publishers, 1984.

Raphael, M., Runaways, America's Lost Youth. Drake Publications, 1974.

Richette, L.A., The Throwaway Children. J.B. Lippincott Co., 1969

Schultz, L. ed., The Sexual Victimology of Youth. Thomas, 1978.

Sturz, E.L.,Widening Circles. Harper & Row, 1983.

Wells, C.F., et. al., Self-Destructive Behavior in Children and Adolescents. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1981.

Wooden, K., Weeping in the Playtime of Others: America's Incarcerated Children. McGraw Hill, 1976.

Magazines and Journals

Adams, G. and Munro, G., "Portrait of the North American Runaway: A Critical Review. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 359-373, 1979

Farber, E., et. al., "Violence in Families of Adolescent Runaways., Child Abuse and Neglect, Vol. 8, pp. 295-299, 1984

Males, C., and Raskin, J., "The Children Nobody Wants", Reader's Digest. January 1984.

Rader, D., "No Place to Hide: A Story of Runaways. Parade Magazine. February 7, 1982.

Rader, D., "Child on the Run: A Deepening American Tragedy." Parade. September 5, 1982.

McCall, C., "Streets of the Lost". Life. July 1983.

"Runaways: A National Problem," Time, August 27, 1973, p. 57.

"An Endless Parade of Runaway Kids," U.S. News & World Report, January 17, 1983.

"A Nation of Runaway Kids,"Newsweek, October 18, 1982.

Englander, S.W, "Some Self-Reported Correlates of Runaway Behavior in Adolescent Females", Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. June 1984, pp. 484-485.

Young, R.L., "Runaways: A Review of Negative Consequences.", Family Relations April 1983, pp. 275-281.

Gutierres, S.E., "A Developmental Perspective on Runaway Behavior: Its Relationship to Child Abuse." Child Welfare., February 1981, pp. 89-94.

Morgan, O.J.,"Runaways: Jurisdiction, Dynmics, and Treatment." Journal of Marital and Family Therapy., January 1982. . pp. 121-127

Liebow, E. et. al. "Runaway Children 12 Years Later - A Follow-Up. Journal of Family Issues. 1980., pp. 165-188.

Government Reports and Studies

Attorney General's Task Force on Family Violence, Final Report, September, 1984, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

"Perspectives on Child Maltreatment in the Mid 80's", Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, 1984, DHHS Publication No. (OHDS) 84-30338.

"Runaway and Homeless Youth: National Program Inspection", Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, October 1983.

"Federally Supported Centers Provide Needed Services for Runaways and Homeless Youths", Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, by the U.S. General Accounting Office, September 26, 1983, #GAO/IPE-83-7.

"Community-Based Correctional Programs Can Do More to Help Offenders", Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General, February 5, 1980, #GGD-80-25.

FY 1983 Annual Report to the Congress on the Status and Accomplishment6s of the Centers Funded Under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families. (issued February 1985).

"Homeless Youth: The Saga of 'Pushouts' and 'Throwaways' in America", Report of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Senate Judiciary Committee, December 1980, Washington, D.C. Document #68-5910.

"Oversight Hearing on Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs", Committee Print of the Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Human Resources, May 5, 1982, Washington, D.C. Document #96-633-0.

"Missing Children's Assistance Act" Committee Print of the Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice, Senate Judiciary Committee, February 7,21, and March 8, 13,21, 1984. Document #34-463-0.

"Sexual Exploitation of Children - A Problem of Unknown Magnitude", U.S. General Accounting Office, April 20, 1982.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHAIRPERSON: Linda Reppond, Alliance for Children, Youth and Families, Seattle, Washington.

VICE CHAIRPERSON: Doug Herzog, Mountain Plains Youth Services, Bismarck, North Dakota

SECRETARY: Liz Goldsmith, San Diego Youth & Community Services, San Diego, California

TREASURER: Marsha Day, Victims Services Agency, New York, New York

Barbara Scanlon — Bridge Over Troubled Waters, Boston, Massachusetts

George Magrill — Youth and Family Alternatives, New Port Richey, Florida

Judith Algeo-McCarty — Tabor Children's Services, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Steve Sperling — Briarpatch, Madison, Wisconsin

James Walker — University of Oklahoma Juvenile Personnel Training Program, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Jim Swain — United Action for Youth, Iowa City, Iowa

Craig Christiansen — The Youthworks, Medford, Oregon

Youth Representative: Theresa Bartoldus
Runaway Youth Coordinating Council
Hempstead, New York

Caucus Representatives

Homeless Youth: Randall Mecham, Youth Advocates, San Francisco, California

Rural Issues: Danny Brown
Community Runaway and Youth Services
Reno, Nevada

National Youth Policy: Sue Matheson, Xanthos
Alameda, California

Executive Director: June Bucy, Washington, D.C.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL NETWORK AND THE NATIONAL FUND FOR RUNAWAY CHILDREN

The National Network is a nonprofit, membership organization of more than 500 community-based shelter programs and other agencies that serve runaway, homeless, and other troubled youth. The National Network started in 1974 when concerned people across the nation became aware of the urgent needs of children who were away from their homes and in danger on the streets. Parents, community leaders, social workers, and others developed shelter programs in their own areas to help these youth and their families. We then organized to assist each other's programs so that we could more effectively help these troubled, homeless youths.

Our foremost goal now is to improve services and policies which affect the lives of the more than 1.3 million runaway and homeless youth in America. Our national office in Washington, D.C. informs our members and other key groups and individuals on the best ways of serving these youths. We promote training and innovative strategies for working with such "high-risk" youth and their families to help them get their lives together.

We provide regular information through our newsletter, do special mailings, sponsor think tanks for youthworkers, and hold an annual symposium. Our nationwide, computerized telecommunications system enables youth programs to exchange information, research findings, and management improvements. Our public awareness campaigns through the media to citizens across the country helps them understand just how widespread and devestating the problems of these youth are. Finally, we monitor public policy which effects youth services at the national, state, and local levels.

The National Network relies on corporate and foundation grants, membership dues, and individual donors to carry out its work. We apply for and use federal funds only when the needs of the public agency match our youth services priorities.

The National Fund for Runaway Children began in 1982 following a series of articles in Parade magazine by Dotson Rader which graphically described the tragic stories of runaway and homeless street kids. These articles moved thousands of concerned individuals and groups to volunteer their time and donate money to help these troubled young people. Until October 1984, the National Fund was administered by Act Together, Inc., at which time the National Network became the legally responsible group.

The National Fund pools contributions from individuals, foundations, corporations, and other groups and makes grants to runaway and homeless youth programs. Since its inception, the National Fund has awarded grants to 53 agencies in 29 states and Washington, D.C. The National Fund also responds to thousands of requests from the general public and the media on the problems and needs of these youth. Finally, the National Fund provides support for a select number of public education projects. This report was printed and distributed with National Fund support.

The National Fund does not receive or use federal funds; all contributions are from private sources.

LIST OF RESPONDENTS

The National Network is grateful to the following youth services agencies for participating in our national survey. These programs are listed under headings for their respective federal regions.

Region I

The Youth Shelter, Greenwich, CT
Youth In Crisis, Bridgeport, CT
The Bridge, West Hartford, CT
Youth Consortium of TRI-RYC, New Haven, CT
Town of Framington, MA
New Beginnings, Greene, ME
Child & Family Services, Manchester, NH
TRI-CAP Group Homes, Warwick, RI
Stopover Shelters of Newport County, Portsmouth, RI
Spectrum, Burlington, VT

Region II

Crossroads, Mt. Holly, NJ
The Starting Point, Atlantic City, NJ
Project Youth Haven, Paterson, NJ
Anchor House, Trenton, NJ
Together, Inc., Glassboro, NJ
Girls Club of Clifton, Clifton, NJ
Group Homes of Camden County, Camden, NJ
La Casa Youth Crisis Shelter, Newark, NJ
Covenant House/Under 21, New York City
Society for Seamen's Children, Staten Island,NY
Westchester Children's Association, White Plains, NY
St. Agatha Home NY Foundling Hospital, Nanuet, NY
Nassau Children's House, Mineola, NY
Victims Services Agency, New York City
Runaway and Homeless Youth Advocacy Project, New York City
The Center for Youth Services, Rochester, NY
Programs and Domiciles, Oneida, NY
River Haven, Poughkeepsie, NY
Oneida County CAP, Rome, NY
Runaway Youth Coordinating Council, Hempstead, NY
Programa Casa/ Centro Sister Isolina Ferre, Ponce, PR

Region III

Valley Youth House, Bethlehem, PA
Centre County Youth Services Bureau, State College, PA
Tabor Children's Services, Doylestown, PA
The Bridge,Catholic Social Services, Wilkes-Barre, PA
The Whale's Tale, Pittsburgh, PA
Voyage House, Philadelphia, PA
Youth Resources Center, Hyattsville, MD
Boys and Girls Home of Montgomery County, Silver Spring, MD
Aid In Dover, Dover, DE
Oasis House/Family Services, Richmond, VA
Volunteer Emergency Foster Care, Richmond, VA
Alternative House/Juvenile Services of McLean, McLean, VA
Children's Home Society/Cherry Hill Shelter, Daniels, WV
Samaritan House, Wheeling, WV
MOVRYSC Shelter, Parkersburg, WV
Children's Home Society,Charleston, WV

Region III (cont.)

Patchwork/Daymark, Charleston, WV
Children's Home Society of West Virgina, Romney, WV

Region IV

Child and Family Services, Knoxville, TN
The Family Link, Memphis, TN
Crossroads/ Family & Children's Services, Chattanooga, TN
RAP House/Oasis House, Nashville, TN
Someplace Else/YMCA, Tallahassee, FL
Miami Bridge/Catholic Community Services, Miami, FL
Switchboard of Miami, Miami, FL
Youth and Family Alternatives, New Port Richey, FL
CAS, Inc., Gainesville, FL
Youth Alternatives, Daytona Beach, FL
Crosswinds, Merritt Island, FL
Beach Place Runaway Center, Tampa, FL
Youth Crisis Center, Jacksonville, FL
Alternative Human Services, St. Petersburg, FL
Sojourn, Mobile, AL
Shelby Youth Services, Alabaster, AL
Our House/Catholic Charities, Jackson, MS
Greenville Group Home for Boys, Greenville, MS
The Alcove, Monroe, GA
Southeastern Network of Runaway,Youth, & Family Services, Athens, GA
Athens Regional Attention Home, Athens, GA
YMCA Shelter House, Louisville, KY
Metro Group Homes, Lexington, KY
Brighton Center, Newport, KY
The Relatives, Charlotte, NC
Youth Care, Inc., Greensboro, NC
Mountain Youth Resources, Cullowhee, NC
Crossroads Runaway Shelter, N. Charleston, SC
Greenhouse Runaway Shelter, Sumter, SC

Region V

Walker's Point Youth & Family Center, Milwaukee, WI
The Runaway Project (RAP), Green Bay, WI
Bifrost, Menomonie, WI
The Runaway Bridge, LaCrosse, WI
Innovative Youth Services of Racine, Racine, WI
Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin & Upper Michigan, Superior,WI
Outagamie County Youth Services, Appleton, WI
Briarpatch, Madison, WI
Pathfinders, Milwaukee, WI
Family Service Division/Catholic Social Services, Monroe, MI
Counterpoint Runaway Shelter, Inkster, MI
The Sanctuary, Royal Oak, MI
Casa Maria, Detroit, MI
The Harbor, Port Huron, MI
Cory Place, Bay City, MI
New Life Youth Services, Cincinnati, OH
Junction Runaway Shelter, Elyria, OH
Safe Space Station, Cleveland, OH
Black Focus on the West Side, Cleveland, OH
Connecting Point, Toledo, OH

Region V (cont.)

Cross Streets, St. Paul Youth Services Bureau, St. Paul, MN
St. Croix Valley Youth Services Bureau, Stillwater, MN
The Bridge for Runaway Youth, Minneapolis, MN
Minneapolis Youth Diversion, MN
Stopover, Indianapolis, IN
Gary Youth Services Bureau, Gary, IN
Youth Services Bureau Runaway Shelter, South Bend, IN
The Blue Gargoyle, Chicago, IL
Haven, Winnetka, IL
Youth Organizations Umbrella, Evanston, IL
Latino Youth, Chicago, IL
TLP, Chicago, IL

Region VI

Youth Services of Tulsa County, Tulsa, OK
Tri-City Youth & Family Center, Choctaw, OK
Youth Services of Grady County, Chickasha, OK
Youth Services for Stephans County, Duncan, OK
Youth Services for Oklahoma County, Oklahoma City, OK
Great Plains Youth & Family Services, Hobart, OK
Okmulgee County Council of Youth Services, Okmulgee, OK
Youth & Family Services of Canadian County, El Reno, OK
Area Youth Shelter, Ada, OK
Muskogee County Council, Muskegee, OK
Cherokee Nation Youth Services, Tahlequah, OK
Youth & Family Resource Center, Shawnee, OK
Moore Youth & Family Services, Moore, OK
Payne County Youth Services, Stillwater, OK
Kiamichi Youth Services/McCurtain County, Idabel, OK
Youth Services of Bryan County, Durant, OK
Northwest Family Services, Alva, OK
Johnston Marshall County Youth Action, OK
Le Flore County Youth Services, OK
Cleveland County Youth & Family Center, Norman, OK
Youth Service Center of North Central Okalhoma, Enid, OK
Youth Services of Osage County, Pawhuska, OK
Junior Helping Hand Home for Children, Austin, TX
Isabel M. Elkins Emergancy Shelter, Houston, TX
Children's Center/Youth Shelter, Galveston, TX
Middle Earth Unlimited, Austin, Tx
Casa de los Amigos, Dallas, TX
Teen Connection, New Braunfels, TX
Space Emergency Youth Shelter, Fort Worth, TX
Grayson County Juvenile Alternatives, Sherman, TX
Chimney Rock Center, Houston, TX
Youth Services of Brazoria, Pearland, TX
Youth Alternatives, San Antonio, TX
Runaway Hotline, Austin, TX
Youth Alternatives/The Greenhouse, New Orleans, LA
Samaritan House, Baldwin, LA
Santa Fe Shelter Care, Santa Fe, NM
New Day Runaway House, Albuquerque, NM
Youth Home, Inc., Little Rock, AR
Stepping Stone, Little Rock, AR

Region VII

Youth and Shelter Services, Ames, IA
Foundation II, Cedar Rapids, IA
Oasis I, Salina, KS
Synergy House, Parkville, MO
Marian Hall, St. Louis, MO.
Youth Emergency Service, University City, MO
Youth Service System of Lincoln/Lancaster County, Lincoln, NB
Panhandle Community Service, Scottsbluff, NB
Youth Emergency Services, Bellevue, NB

Region VIII

Salt Lake County Youth Services Center, Murray, UT
Fargo Youth Commission, Fargo, ND
Charles Hall Youth Services, Bismarck, ND
Discovery House, Anaconda, MT
Missoula Youth Homes, Missoula, MT
Tumbleweed Runaway Program, Billings, MT
Attention, Boulder, CO
Volunteers of America/Bannock Shelters, Denver, CO
New Beginnings, Aberdeen, SD
Threshold, Sioux Falls, SD
Project Youth, Sheridan, WY
Laramie Youth Crisis Center, Laramie, WY

Region IX

YMCA Project Oz, Carlsbad, CA
Youth Services, Santa Cruz, CA
Youth Advocates 9 Grove Lane, San Anselmo, CA
San Diego Youth Involvement Project, San Diego, CA
High-Risk Youth Project, Los Angeles, CA
San Diego Youth & Community Services Gatehouse, San Diego, CA
San Diego Youth & Community Services Bridge, San Diego, CA
Gay & Lesbian Community Services Center, Los Angeles, CA
YMCA Project Oz, San Diego, CA
Community Congress of San Diego, San Diego, CA
Juvenile Crisis Resolution Program, San Diego, CA
Diogenes Youth Services, Sacramento, CA
Tahoe Human Services, South Lake Tahoe, CA
Xanthos, Alameda, CA
Interface Ventura County, Newbury Park, CA
Klein Bottle Social Advocates for Youth, Santa Barbara, CA
Options House/Hollywood Human Services, Hollywood, CA
Homeless and Emergency Runaway Effort, Chico, CA
Odyssey Program of Western Youth Services, Fullerton, CA
Youth ETC,. Phoenix, AZ
Yuma County Child Abuse, Yjma, AZ
Open Inn, Tucson, AZ
Hale Kipa, Honolulu, HI
Hale Opio Kauai, Koloa, HI
The Salvation Army-Hilo Interim Home, Hilo, HI
Central Oahu Youth Services Association, Haleiwa, HI
Community Runaway and Youth Services, Reno, NV

Region X

Northwest Youth Services, Bellingham, WA
Thurston Youth Services Society, Olympia
Looking Glass Youth & Family Servcies, Eugene, OR
The Youthworks, Medford, OR
Harry's Mother/Janis Youth Porgrams, Portland, OR
Runaway Shelter Project, Salem, OR
Bannock House, Pocatello, ID
Family Connection, Anchorage, AK
Alaska Youth & Parent Foundation/Alaska Youth Advocates, Anchorage,AK
Family Focus, Fairbanks, AK